DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 546 CS 501 460

AUTHOR Cole, Terry W.
TITLE The Wobblie's Free Speech Fights: A Case Study in 20th Century Revolutionaries.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (San Antonio, Texas, April 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Case Studies; Culture Conflict; *Freedom of Speech; Industrial Personnel; *Labor Unions; *Persuasive Discourse; Public Speaking; *Revolution; Semiskilled Workers; Social Action; Unions; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Industrial Workers of the World; *IWW

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the free speech fights, one of the more revolutionary tactics of the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.), founded in 1905 by a small group of socialists, anarchists, industrial unionists, and dissident trade unionists. Two considerations guide this examination. The first is the rhetorical nature of the free speech fight and the manner in which it advanced the rhetorical program of the I.W.W., including winning the right to use the streets for speech making, confirming the viability of working-class solidarity, and producing greatly needed publicity. The second consideration involves the free speech implications of the tactic, especially the drawing of national attention to the preservation of this basic American right. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED126546

THE WOBBLIE'S FREE SPEECH FIGHTS: A CASE STUDY IN 20TH CENTURY REVOLUTIONARIES

by

Terry W. Cole

Appalachian State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terry W. Cole

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Presented at the Southern Speech Communication Association Convention, April, 1976, San Antonio, Texas.

CS501460

THE WOBBLIE'S FREE SPEECH FIGHTS: A CASE STUDY IN 20TH CENTURY REVOLUTIONARIES[1]

Terry W. Cole

Professor Paul Brandes suggests a continuing American revolution when he observes in The Rhetoric of Revolt that "We are experiencing what will undoubtedly be called a century of revolution. . . ."[2] Indeed, in the twentieth century alone many groups reflecting diverse, even polarized points of view have responded to a variety of dissatisfactions with the political, economic, or social order of the day and sought to significantly alter American society. It is of no small interest that these revolutionary stirrings have more frequently taken the form of calls to the mind rather than calls to arms; a condition undoubtedly influenced by the nature of the American society. Consequently, the continuing American revolution has been largely a rhetorical experience.

It is in the interest of understanding more of the nature of that rhetorical response and, perhaps the revolution itself, that the present essay examines a participant in the continuing American revolution, the Industrial Workers of the World and one of its more revolutionary tactics, the free speech fight. Two considerations will guide our inquiry: (1) the rhetorical nature of the free speech fight and the manner in which it advanced the rhetorical program of the I.W.W. and (2) the free speech implications of the tactic.

In his monograph on "The Rhetorical Situation" Lloyd Bitzer tells us that an exigency in the rhetorical situation prompts the development of rhetorical responses.[3] It was in recognition of just such an exigency that the IWW developed and employed the tactic of the free speech fight over twenty-five times between 1909 and 1915. A brief examination of the IWW itself will shed insight into both the rationale for the free speech fight and the nature of the tactic.

The IWW was founded in 1905 by a small group of Socialists, anarcists, industrial unionists, and dissident trade unionists. Out of their collective dissatisfaction with the economic and industrial conditions of the period emerged a radical, Marxian ideology of "revolutionary industrial unionism." The ideology not only called for the organization of the working class along industrial lines but also it advocated the total abolition of capitalism and the rejection of capitalism's tools; political action, legal reform, and organized religion. Thus, the function of the new organization was not only to organize workers in the tradition of the labor union but also to educate the working class in the evils of the capitalist system. Indeed, during the first decade of its existence the IWW was more of a propaganda society than a viable labor union.

Given the radical ideology of the IWW and the equally reactionary tendencies of the defenders of capitalism, it was highly predictible that the two ideologies should eventually clash. The clash took place in the conservative

communities of the Pacific Northwest and California where the IWW was conducting an active agitation among itinerate lumber workers and migratory farm workers. The IWW relied heavily upon the propaganda of the soapboxers to reach these laborers where they wintered in the skid rows of Western communities.[4] These colorful soapboxers would attract large crowds of idle workers and propagandize them through the spoken word and the distribution of literature. Obviously, it was essential that these agitators have the free use of the streets if they were to reach those workers most receptive to the Wobbly message. Clearly aware of this need and totally hostile to the ideology of the IWW, employer interests pressured municipal governments into closing the streets to Wobbly agitators through the passage of street speaking ordinances or, in some instances, through the use of "cooperative" police censor squads.[5] Faced with a damaging limitation to its agitation program, the IWW met the ordinances with the direct action of the free speech fight--a form of civil disobedience (body rhetoric if you will) designed to force the abolition of street speaking laws by causing so many Wobblies to be arrested and jailed for violating the law that the city could no longer afford the resources or manpower to enforce it.

The pattern developed in an almost classic form of civil disobedience. Once it was decided to fight a street speaking law the call would go out through the Wobbly press and "General Office Bulletins" for all footlose members of the IWW to come to the particular community and join the fight.[6] A typical call is found in the Industrial Worker for February 26, 1910:

> 5,000 man and women, who believe in Freedom of Speech, press, and Public Assemblage, to be in Spokane, Wash, on March 1st and show contempt for home-made laws that are enacted for the purpose of keeping the workers in ignorance.
>
> (Remember if all this can happen here it can happen to all workers.)
>
> Come and show your contempt for those who tramped the Constitution of the United States into the Earth, and thus break the laws themselves.[7]

The spirit in which the call was answered is reflected in the following letter printed in the Industrial Worker:

> Fellow Worker:
>
> A demonstration meeting was just held in Sheep Camp No. 1, there being three present, a herder and two dogs. The following resolutions were adopted:
>
> Resolved, that we send $10.00 for the free speech fight in Spokane.
>
> Yours for liberty.
>
> Thos. J. Anderson
>
> P.S. -- Stay with it. I'm coming -- T.J.A.[8]

Once on the scene, the Wobblies would line up to speak at a designated street corner. Those unable to speak would read aloud from such documents as the Constitution or Declaration of Independence. True to form, the police would move in and arrest the offending speaker and cart him off to jail. No sooner would one speaker be arrested than another would take his place. And thus the cycle continued until the jails were filled beyond capacity. The Wobblies would then tax the courts by demanding a separate trial. In this fashion, the IWW made it financially and physically prohibitive to enforce the ordinance and, in most instances, forced the municipality to abolish or significantly alter its street speaking law.

The Spokane free speech fight illustrates the scope and effectiveness of the tactic. The fight was called in Spokane in 1909 and lasted some five months.

During its course more than 600 Wobblies were jailed and more than 1,200 arrests were made. Still, fresh Wobblies arrived from points as far away as Pennsylvania, Maine, Canada, and Mexico.[9] By March 5, 1910, five months after the fight had begun, the city capitulated and granted the IWW most of its demands.[10]

Clearly, the free speech fight was a rhetorical tactic in the civil disobedience tradition we have come to know in the civil rights and anti-war protests of the 1960's and 1970's. In his searching essay on "The Rhetoric of the Streets," Professor Franklyn Haiman justifies such rhetorical tactics as appropriate when "the norms of the democratic process may be inapplicable to the situations in which these strategies are employed."[11] To the Wobbly agitator, the situation being confronted clearly limited the available means of persuasion. In the first place, the IWW was in a position of weakness vis-a-vis the legal and political establishment. The membership was largely disenfranchised by virtue of its itinerate life-style. Moreover, it did not possess entre' to the councils of government and consequently could not affect change from within. Moreover, the ideological intransigence of the movement itself limited its options -- political or judicial avenues of redress were steadfastly rejected as contrary to the tradition of the class struggle. Even if the IWW had chosen to challenge the constitutionality of the laws in the courts it is doubtful that such appeals would have worked. The Fourteenth Amendment door to First Amendment challenges of municipal or state laws was not to be opened until 1925 with the ruling in Gitlow vs. New York (268 US 652). Thus, direct action through civil disobedience became the most viable available means of persuasion.

Additional insight into the rhetorical nature of civil disobedience tactics such as the free speech fights is provided by Bowers and Ochs in their work on The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control. Such tactics are rhetorical, they argue, because they are both instrumental and symbolic.[12] The free speech fights were instrumental acts to the degree that they were specific means to an end (the abolition of street speaking laws) rather than ends in themselves. They were pragmatic or purposive, clearly an available means of persuasion. The free speech fights were also symbolic. The IWW used the physical presence of its participating membership as a symbol of its strong conviction against gag laws. Moreover, this form of protest was directed to a clear audience -- the members of the communities in which the fights occurred. By inviting arrest, jail, and persecution, the free speech fighters were dramatizing and illuminating a specific condition warranting change. The citizens observing the agitation were forced to at least address themselves to the condition -- many were compelled to take the side of the IWW and further advance the call for change. Roger Baldwin, the founder of the American Civil Liberties Union spoke to the ultimate success of the tactic:

> Far more effective is this direct action of open conflict than all the legal maneuvers in the courts to get rights that no government willingly grants. Power wins rights -- the power of determination, backed by willingness to suffer jail or violence, to get them.[13]

While the primary task of the free speech fight was to win the right to use the streets for speech making, the tactic also advanced the rhetorical program of the IWW in other areas. First, the free speech fight confirmed the viability of working class solidarity -- one of the most consistent strategies employed by Wobbly propagandists. In fact, the strategy was so pervasively evident in the rhetoric of the movement that labor historian Joseph Conlin was led to conclude that the entire philosophy of the IWW could be summed up in the word "solidarity."[14]

As a rhetorical strategy, solidarity "produces or reinforces the cohesiveness of its members, thereby increasing their responsiveness to group wishes."[15] To the IWW, solidarity was power -- the power of the working class united. Wobbly ideologue W.E. Trautmann commented upon the manner in which the free speech fights confirmed the cohesive power of working class solidarity:

> We appeal to a candid world of workers to aid us in this struggle so that the corporations of the West and their city officials of Spokane can be given the lesson that more powerful than the agencies of oppression and brutal force is the power of the combined workers of this country.[16]

Likewise, the IWW newspaper Solidarity observed: "By use of its weakest weapon -- passive resistance -- labor forced civic authorities to recognize a power equal to the state."[17]

Equally basic to the ideology of the IWW was the doctrine of the class struggle -- a doctrine rhetorically advanced through a strategy of polarization. To the IWW the class struggle and its inherent polarization was not mere Marxian theory, it was a fact of life, a fact voiced in the opening paragraph of the IWW Preamble:

> The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace as long as hunger and want are found among millions of the working people and the few, who make up the employing class have all the good things of life.

Nothing illustrated the class struggle more vividly nor gave the IWW a greater opportunity to prove the fact of class polarization than the free speech fights.

Whereas IWW class struggle rhetoric argued the existence of a breach between the classes, the free speech fights, to a significant degree, illustrated and exacerbated that breach. Useful insight into the nature of the polarization may be gained by applying a stratedy identified by James F. Klumpp in his analysis of the rhetoric of the 1968 student revolt at Columbia University -- a strategy he labeled "polar-rejective identification."[18] According to Klumpp's analysis, "the strategy's success rests on the rejection of established leadership in a polarized environment." In such a setting an audience (or community) is forced to choose between the establishment and the agents of agitation (in the instance of the free speech fights the legal authorities of the community and the IWW). "With such a choice forced on the community," Klumpp observed, "the radicals could succeed without the necessity of pulling the community toward their position but by creating a situation in which the [establishment] drove the community toward the radical alternative."[19] Bowers and Ochs similarly observed that polarization occurs "by forcing such a strong negative reaction to the emotionally charged flag issue [the denial of free speech and police brutality] that condemnation of flag individuals and groups [municipal officials] would follow." "A choice would be forced," they concluded, "neutrality would be most difficult."[20] The polarization is completed when the "radicals" accurately predict the establishment's reactions and the establishment is rejected. Although the Wobbly victory in the free speech fights did not necessarily spring from a complete rejection of municipal establishments, most factors of the polar-rejective identification strategy were present: the IWW pitted itself against the establishment with non-violent protest and the establishment responded, as predicted, with extra-legal repression and violence. Many learned from the graphic lessons of the fights and many found themselves sympathetic to the Wobbly cause.

During the course of the free speech fights Wobbly rhetors advanced the polarization strategy with an anti-establishment invictive campaign labeling as lawbreakers those who would deny free speech to the IWW:

> In Spokane under the guise of LAW -- which the workers have been taught to respect and obey as being sacred -- the organized Capitalists are trying to steal from the unorganized workers, basic rights that the working class has won by long centuries of struggle.
>
> The fundamental principles of Free Speech, Free Press and Free Assembly are at stake. . . . Even the right to organize -- the very breath of life to the working class -- is being denied the workers in Spokane.[21]

During the Missoula, Montana free speech fight the Industrial Worker advanced the following attack upon the establishment -- an attack which was intended to carry a strong lesson for its readers:

> There is one good thing about this gag-law business; it is causing all thinking working people to see that the "liberties" of the United States constitution do not exist, and that a working man or woman has no rights that his employer need respect, unless the workers have the power to enforce respect. . . . The employer agents are the ones who have passed the Spokane gag-law, and it is, of course, the employing class generally who are responsible for this.[22]

The rhetoric also took ample advantage of every act of brutality on the part of the law enforcement officers and vigilantes -- a tactic which intensified the polarization. Many articles and photographs appeared in the Wobbly press vividly recounting the brutality visited upon free speech fighters by the forces of "law and order." In this manner the acts of brutality became rhetorically valuable object lessons.

The facts behind the lesson were valid. Not only were the gag-laws initiated by employers' agents and chambers of commerce[23] but the weapons used against the IWW were generally as brutal as the Wobbly press contended. Spokane authorities enforced "law and order" with incarceration in drafty, unheated buildings in the middle of winter. Prisoners were tortured in eight-by-six sweat boxes and returned to icy cells. Fresno prisoners were treated with bread and water diets and bruising showers from 150 pound-pressure fire hoses.[24] Prisoners from the brutal free speech fight in San Diego were punished at the hands of legal and extra-legal vigilantes. Free speech fighters, some of whom were not even Wobblies, were kidnapped and taken out of town where they were forced to strip, run a gauntlet of some 75 men armed with sticks, blackjacks, and whips, and forced to kiss the flag and sing the national anthem.[25]

The rhetorical value of publicizing acts of establishment brutality was demonstrated in practically every free speech fight. The message was clear: the IWW had used non-violent means to gain constitutional rights -- the authorities responded with brutality and inhumane treatment. Faced with a polarization difficult to deal with, many heretofor hostile to the IWW were forced by conscience into a position of sympathy for the free speech fighters. Thus, during the fights, "an outraged citizenry . . . played a crucial role" in the ultimate victory.[26] Liberal voices rose in defense of the IWW in the face of increasingly ugly police tactics. In Spokane, civic leaders, respected clergymen, and many leading Socialists gave sympathy and support to the cause. One local attorney, watching the arrests from his office window, became incensed

enough to join the speakers and, consequently, the jailed Wobblies. In Missoula, Senator Robert LaFollett, in town for a visit, gave a speech in support of the free speech fighters.[27] Throughout the fights support was received from Socialist Party locals and other unions including the United Mine Workers of America and the Western Federation of Miners, and statements of support came from Washington, Montana, California, Nevada, Arizona, and Nebraska.[28]

More significantly, however, the reaction of municipal authorities stimulated sympathetic support from sources and persons traditionally opposed to the IWW and what it stood for. Fred Niederhauses, a reporter for the Spokane Evening Chronicle (a paper editorially opposed to the IWW), reflected honest shock following a visit to the Spokane jail:

> If those men had murdered my own mother, I would not see them put to the slow torture to which I saw them being subjected . . . last night. If a resident of Spokane should place any of his dumb beasts in the condition which I saw the men, arrested for street speaking . . . he would be promptly arrested by the humane officer.[29]

The Sacramento Bee (also unfriendly to the IWW) reacted to the Fresno atrocities with the comment: "When the good citizens and authorities of any city countenance such outrages as those committed by the Fresno mob, the I.W.W. may be said to shine by comparison."[30] The most telling commentary on "law and order" brutality was rendered by an outspoken opponent of the IWW, Harris Weinstock, Special Commissioner to the Governor of California, who reported in his investigation of the San Diego free speech fight:

> Your commissioner is frank to confess that when he became satisfied of the truth of the stories, as related by these unfortunate men, it was hard for him to believe that he still was not sojourning in Russia, conducting his investigation there, instead of in this alleged "land of the free and home of the brave." Surely, these American men who, as the overwhelming evidence shows, in large numbers assaulted with weapons in a most cowardly and brutal manner their helpless and defenseless fellows, were certainly far from "brave" and their victims far from "free."

Weinstock concluded with a statement that could well have come from the mouth of a Wobbly rhetor:

> The question naturally arises, therefore, who are the greater criminals; who are the real anarchists; who are the real violators of the constitution; who are the real undesirables -- these so-called unfortunate members of "the scum of the earth," or these presumably respectable members of society?[31]

No Wobbly soapboxer could have more effectively underscored the polarization of the class struggle than did the brutality of the free speech fights or the shocked disgust in the unbiased testimony of some of those who reported it.

Finally, the free speech fights advanced the rhetorical effort of the IWW by producing badly needed publicity. Bowers and Ochs observed that agitating groups were frequently unable to get a broad promulgation of their messages because the establishment press, usually supported by the advertising of business interests, either refused to report it at all or distorted the information about groups in opposition to those interests. The appropriate response of the agitating group was to "stage events that they know to be newsworthy."[32] Faced with such a problem throughout the Western communities in which it agitated, the IWW found the free speech fights to be the exact solution it needed.

The IWW was seldom favorably reported in the general press. In the years of the free speech fights negative reports reached vitrolic heights as the establishment responded to the agitation. For example, during the San Diego free speech fight the San Diego Tribune remarked:

> Hanging is none too good for them [meaning the IWW] and they would be much better dead; for they are absolutely useless in the human economy; they are the waste material of creation and should be drained off into the sewer of oblivion there to rot . . . like any other excrement.[33]

Half way across the state the San Francisco Call editorialized:

> The I.W.W. are disloyal to this government, foes alike of labor, of capital, of organized society. They should not be permitted to preach or teach or practice their hateful doctrines anywhere in the United States."[34]

It is not difficult to comprehend that "good press" would not come from papers holding such editorial positions.

However, free speech fights were newsworthy and, for a time they forced the press at least to report on the IWW and, even at times, say something positive, albeit grudgingly. In this fashion, the free speech fights were covered nationally. For instance, the trek of free speech fighters en route to Fresno from points all over the country was covered by newspapers in St. Louis, Kansas City, and Denver. Even the hostile San Francisco Call commented with bewilderment and even a hint of admiration:

> . . . It is one of those strange situations which crop up suddenly and are hard to understand. Some thousands of men, whose business is to work with their hands, tramping and stealing rides, suffering hardships and facing dangers -- to get into jail. And to get into that particular jail in a town of which they never heard before, in which they have no direct interest.[35]

The tangible gains of such publicity is difficult to measure. It is a fact that following the San Diego free speech fight (the last major fight to be fought in California and the recipient of the largest amount of publicity) Wobbly locals sprung up in communities throughout California.[36] The correlation does suggest some possible gains in membership growth. However, more ideologically related gains were also made, as confirmed by labor historian Phillip Foner:

> These battles publicized the I.W.W. and made the people aware of the existence of a national organization dedicated to preserve a basic principle of American democracy -- freedom of speech -- at a time when no other national organization existed to uphold this principle.[37]

The free speech fight was a pragmatic and symbolic act of civil disobedience. As such it was clearly rhetorical. However, the rhetorical pragmatism of the free speech fights to the contrary not withstanding, the free speech fights also defended freedom of speech at a time when few other defenders chose to do so. However, the motivation behind the Wobbly's dedication to preserve the principle of freedom of speech is somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand, the overt defense of freedom of speech was, on its face, a pragmatic attempt to protect a basic organizational tool -- the soapboxer. As Wobbly historian Melvyn Dubofsky observed:

> For Wobblies free-speech fights involved nothing so abstract as defending the constitution, preserving the Bill of Rights, or protecting the civil liberties of American citizens. They were instigated primarily to overcome resistance to IWW organizing tactics and also to demonstrate that America's dispossessed could through direct action, challenge established authority.[38]

Indeed, the IWW never chose to challenge the constitutionality of their denial of freedom of speech in the courts. Rather, the IWW chose civil disobedience. Perhaps the success of the tactic is one reason why a legal challenge was never made. Also, the IWW's distrust of the judiciary might also explain the absence of a legal challenge.

However, the IWW did have a clearly defined concept of freedom of speech. "Freedom of speech is a natural right," proclaimed a group of Minneapolis Wobblies, "and no man or set of men, no government . . . has the moral or constitutional right to prevent the exercise of the same."[39] Some Wobbly opinion did share common agreement with the position to be taken later by Oliver Wendell Holmes that truth can only come from a "free trade in ideas" -- only in the "competition of the market."[40] For example, a Portland Wobbly wrote:

> . . . The raggedest imbecile, if you please, has the right to give his fellow men the thoughts his Creator put in his brain. You do not know but that in the glacial movement of the ages his thoughts may turn out to be truth and yours the lie.[41]

Likewise, Wobbly writer Mark Stone penned: "Belief in free speech is the conviction that bad ideas (if there is any such thing) need only complete freedom for the expression of opposite ideas to render the bad ones futile, harmless, and ridiculous."[42]

What, then, can be concluded about the role played by the IWW in extending freedom of speech? One point stands out, whether the IWW defended free speech as a means to an end or as an end in itself the free speech fights drew national attention to the preservation of that most basic American right. The fights did expose to public view inequities visited upon those who would defend basic constitutional liberties. At the least, by winning for itself the right to agitate upon the streets the IWW opened this door to all who would follow. Roger Baldwin spoke to this point in the following tribute to the IWW and the free speech fight:

> The little minority of the working class represented in the IWW blazed the trail in those ten years of fighting for free speech which the entire American working class must in some fashion follow.[43]

FOOTNOTES

[1]The paper is drawn largely from the author's doctoral dissertation: "Labor's Radical Alternative: The Rhetoric of the Industrial Workers of the World" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1974).

[2]Paul Brandes, The Rhetoric of Revolt (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 2.

[3]Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," Philosophy and Rhetoric, I (January, 1968), 1-15.

[4]Melvyn Dubofsky, We Shall Be All: A History of the Industrial Workers of the World (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969), p. 174.

[5]Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States, Volume IV: The Industrial Workers of the World, 1905-1917 (New York: International Publishers, 1965), pp. 172, ff.

[6]Vincent St. John, Final Report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations -- Testimony, Vol. II, Sen. Doc. 415, 64th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1471; se also, General Headquarters Bulletin, IWW, #72 (November 9, 1915), p. 2 in Government Exhibits, Transcript of Record in the case of U.S.A. vs. William D. Haywood, et al., I.W.W. Collection, Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs, Wayne State University.

[7]"A Call to Action," Industrial Worker, February 16, 1910, p. 2.

[8]Fred W. Heselwood, "Barbarous Spokane," Industrial Worker, March 5, 1910, p. 4.

[9]Foner, Workers of the World, p. 182.

[10]Foner, Workers of the World, pp. 182 - 83.

[11]Franklyn Haiman, "The Rhetoric of the Streets: Some Legal and Ethical Considerations," QJS, 52 (April, 1962), 114.

[12]John Waite Bowers and Donovan J. Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1971) pp. 32-33.

[13]IWW, Twenty Five Years of Industrial Unionism (Chicago: I.W.W. Publishing Bureau, 1930), cited in Dubofsky, We Shall Be All, p. 174.

[14]Joseph R. Conlin, "The Wobblies: A Study of the Industrial Workers of the World Before World War I" (unpublished PH.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966), p. 45.

[15]Bowers and Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation, p. 20.

[16]W. E. Trautmann, "The Horrors and Outrages of the Congo in Spokane," Industrial Worker, February 26, 1910, p. 4.

[17]Solidarity, March 19, 1910, p. 2; cited in Dubofsky, We Shall Be All, pp. 183-84.

[18]James F. Klumpp, "Challenge of Radical Rhetoric: Radicalization at Columbia," Western Speech, XXXVII (Summer, 1973), 146-56.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Bowers and Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation, p. 27.

[21]"On to Spokane March First," Industrial Worker, February 19, 1910, p. 1.

[22]"The Missoula Free Speech Fight," Industrial Worker, October 20, 1909, p. 2.

[23]Dubofsky, We Shall Be All, p. 176; Joyce Kornbluh, Rebel Voices: An I.W.W. Anthology (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1968), p. 95.

[24]Dubofsky, We Shall Be All, pp. 178-80, 187-88; Foner, Workers of the World, pp. 179-81, 187.

[25]Foner, Workers of the World, pp. 197-202; Harris Weinstock, Report of Harris Weinstock, Commissioner to Investigate the Recent Disturbances in the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego, California to His Excellency Hiram W. Johnson, Governor of California (Sacramento: Superintendent of State Printing, 1912), pp. 14-16.

[26]Joseph Conlin, Bread and Roses Too: Studies of the Wobblies, (Greenwood, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Co., 1969), p. 77.

[27]Conlin, Bread and Roses, p. 77; Foner, Workers of the World, p. 177; Robert L. Tyler, Rebels of the Woods: The I.W.W. in the Pacific Northwest (Eugene: University of Oregon Books, 1967), pp. 36-37.

[28]"Spokane Grows Famous for Gag Laws," Industrial Worker, April 8, 1909, p. 3; "Gag Law Angers Them," Industrial Worker, April 22, 1909, p. 3.

[29]Reprinted in Industrial Worker, November 3, 1909, p. 1.

[30]Reprinted in Industrial Worker, December 22, 1910, p. 1.

[31]Weinstock, Report, pp. 16-17, 20.

[32]Bowers and Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation, pp. 18-20.

[33]"Raising Vagrants to the Dignity of Great Criminals," San Diego Tribune, March 4, 1912; cited in Weinstock, Report, p. 18.

[34]San Francisco Call, May 31, 1912; cited in Foner, Workers of the World, p. 205.

[35]San Francisco Call, March 2, 1911; cited in Foner, Workers of the World, p. 188.

[36]Carey McWilliams, Factories in the Fields: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1939), p. 157.

[37]Foner, Workers of the World, p. 212.

[38]Dubofsky, We Shall Be All, p. 173.

[39]"Free Speech and Governmentalism," Industrial Worker, December 15, 1909, p. 4.

[40]Oliver Wendell Holmes, "Dissenting Opinion," Abrams vs. United States, 250 US 616 (1919); cited in Franklyn S. Haiman, ed., Freedom of Speech: Issues and Cases (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 55.

[41]"Resolutions from Portland," Industrial Worker, December 1, 1909, p. 4.

[42]Mark Stone, "An Analysis of Free Speech," Industrial Worker, October 20, 1917, p. 3.

[43]I.W.W., Twenty-Five Years of Industrial Unionism, p. 20.